BUDGET FOR 1954-55—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

(Procedure with respect to Debate.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the voting of Demands for Grants for the year 1954-55. We have now seven Demands to-day 1 to 5, 13 and 36. I hope the members will agree if the time is allotted as follows :

Land Revenue till 2-30 P.M., State Excise Duties from 2-30 to 3 P.M. Forest from 3 to 4 P.M., 4 to 5 P.M. General Administration. I think this will suit the House. If any alternative is acceptable to the House, I will adopt it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I suggest that we may concentrate our attention on Land Revenue and State Excise Duties.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In fact, some of the cut motions tabled by some of the members under Land Revenue, strictly speaking, fall under the District Administration. That is why at least two hours for the General Administration would be necessary and desirable. It is left to you.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—All right, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, we will take up Land Revenue. Instead of moving any particular cut motion, I would like to propose that members may choose to speak on the particular motion and the Hon'ble Minister will make a reply and put the whole Demand to vote. I think, members would agree to this. Instead of moving every cut motion or a particular cut motion, general remarks may be made and the Minister will reply. Then, the whole demand will be put to vote. All that is to just see that within the specified time these Demands will be over.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—It will be another general debate. The object of bringing in the cut motion is.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I know the object ; that means two or three cut motions under each Demand will be taken up for consideration. If the House is so satisfied, I will leave it. But, there may be some very important cut motions which are tabled at the end, at the close of each Demand. It is with a view to give chance to such members I suggested this. But, if the alternative is acceptable to the House, I leave it to Members.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—May I suggest, Sir, a number of cut motions are of similar nature. You can avoid cut motions of similar nature and cut motions which raise important matters may be taken up. I believe, we will keep in mind the advice tendered by the Chair and avoid cut motions of similar nature, and the other members may also be allowed to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Provided other members would agree ; that is the difficulty. If a particular cut motion is taken, each member would like to prefer to speak on his own cut motion. Just to avoid it, I suggested this. Anyhow, some practice is to be followed to-day.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—With great respect to the Chair, I want to submit as follows :—This practice of sending cut motions on Demands is in vogue for several years. I believe that a time has arisen when this Hon'ble House has to consider this form of practice, because as everyone of us are aware, most of the cut motions resolve or level themselves down to some sort of local grievances and they are being urged before the House. I believe, Sir, that the very effect of the cut motions that have been tabled is a sort of censure against the Treasury Bench. I am not reflecting against the cut motions tabled by the Members in opposition or by the Members of the Party in power. That apart, all these cut motions pertain to local grievances mostly which could have been put before the House by interpellations. I suggest therefore that the practice of tabling cut motions may be stopped and the Rules of Procedure amended in such a manner that these ten days or more may be allowed for discussion of several Heads when we can concentrate ourselves to a particular Head.

In fact the object of discussion on several Demands according to parliamentary practice is to give the Opposition the greatest number of hours so

that remarks made by them be effective on the Treasury Benches. That is how I have understood the practice prevailing in the British Parliament. Therefore it is better that we revise our system of cut motions being taken up for discussion by allowing a member to move his cut motion and other members either to support or to oppose the cut motion. This practice not merely takes away a large part of the time of the House but also the effect of the suggestions offered by the Opposition Members would vanish. In fact these cut motions, as I have said, refer to some sort of local grievances. So we may debate one or two cut motions and the rest of the time can be devoted for a general discussion of the Demand. I believe that with this little deviation in practice we can go to the practical and parliamentary method of debating these Demands as is obtaining in other legislatures or in the British Parliament. I suggest and I hope the House will agree, that in course of time cut motions should be done away with and we should devote our time to debate on one or two grants each day. Of course the number of days may have to be more. In that case, the general discussion of the Demand will be more effective, because we will be dealing with each and every item of Demand. Thereby not merely we will have definite control over each item of Demand but also our voice will be felt effectively. So from this point of view I suggest that only two or three cut motions be taken under each Demand and the rest of the time devoted for general discussion on the particular heads of Demands. I believe this practice will become a regular one by suitable changes in our Rules of Procedure.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—I wholeheartedly agree to that suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House has already agreed to the Land Revenue demand being over by 2-30 P.M. 20 minutes are already over. I do not want any further suggestion in the matter. I think that is unnecessary. If members come to an ageeement, it is well and good. Otherwise, I will take up cut motions one by one.

(Sri J. Mohamed Imam rose).

Mr. SPEAKER.—No further speech.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Of course. We are agreeable to the suggestion made by you. We are not very particular to move cut motions. Since we have got only very limited time I think we can discuss the Demand and while discussing, members who have sent cut motions may cover those points. I think a time limit may also be fixed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is agreed upon.

(Sri M. Madiah interrupted).

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may please resume his seat. I will take up cut motions in the order they are tabled.

Sri M. MADIAH.—I said, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—There was no necessity for you to speak. Motion moved :

> "That a sum not exceeding Rs. 33,69,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1955, in respect of 'Land Revenue'."

I will now adopt the procedure adopted last time. If the Minister wishes to make a statement at the very outset, he can do so; or he can reply at the end to each cut motion.

***Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T. Narasipur).—Sir, I beg to oppose the Demand. As it is today, the record of rights work is being done by the revenue authorities. By record of rights I mean maintaining the indexing of land records and posting mutations slips in that book. The Sub-Registrar collects the mutation fee at the time of any transaction that is registered in the Sub-Registry Office and the same slip noting thereon the survey number that is contained in the document is forwarded to the Revenue Department for posting in the index of land records. Last year also I had brought to the notice of the Government that there has been a lot of arrears in posting mutation slips. The position has improved a little but it is not being worked efficiently. When you have

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

raised our taxes to the level of taxes in the Madras State in the wake of the merger of Bellary to this State, it is but right that you should also adopt the procedure adopted in the Madras State for the maintenance of these raiyatwari records. In the Madras State, this indexing of land records under the raiyatwari system is being done in the Sub-Registrar's office. So I urge that the maintenance of the index of records and the posting of mutations be entrusted to the Sub-Registrar himself. That will avoid delay in posting. It will also assure that the name of the person getting a right of registration is registered in the index of land records. That would solve a number of difficulties. At present for several years the right of an individual in his land is not posted in the Land Records Register. The Revenue authorities take time to post. In some cases the recital in the document presented for registration at the Sub-Registrar's office will not correspond with that in the original record. For measurements they refer to Survey Department. For making a division of survey number in accordance with the registered document they must automatically refer the case to Taluk Surveyor. The Sub-Registrar can as well refer the cases to the Taluk Surveyor.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—If there is a dispute ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In such cases there are other courses open. There is the civil court.

Sri B. T. KEMPA RAJ (Bangalore South—Scheduled Castes).—On a point of order. I cannot understand the procedure adopted. The Hon'ble Member who is just speaking has got a cut motion of the same nature. He can move it when his cut motion is taken up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That means you have not listened to me or to what some member said.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು—ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ನನಗೆ ಕೇಳಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿರೆಂಬುದೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಲಸ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿರುವ cut motions ಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದಾದಮೇಲೊಂದು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆ. Usually members move cut motions. If they are not allowed to move cut motions, I submit that our privileges may be safeguarded. That is how we have understood about the procedure adopted now.

A MEMBER.—You are in the back bench and that is why...

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Let me recall to the House the understanding arrived at during the last session of the Assembly.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepally—Gudibanda).—Please give a ruling. We do not want to handicap the Chair.

A MEMBER.—I submit to the Chair that an opportunity may be given to at least some of the movers of cut motions by fixing a time limit for each member.

Sri M. MADIAH.—For the last three years, even after the Constitution came into force, members of the ruling party did not press their cut motions. As suggested by some friends, the practice already followed may be continued.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ—ಹೊಸನಗರ).—Treasury Bench ನವರಿಗೆ ಈ cut motions move ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಬಾರದು. Opposition ನವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ cut motions move ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಬೇಕು.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—A couple of minutes may be given to each cut motion.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—In obedience to the ruling already given by the Chair, I suggest that such of those members who are anxious to speak on the Demands and who have already tabled cut motions, may be given preference to others who have not tabled cut motions. Thereby some of these members can speak on the demands. In that way we may overcome the difficulties.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—But we can oppose the Demand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So it is obvious that there is no common understanding. May I take it like that ? I am bound to follow the usual practice as per rules. The first cut motion stands in the name of Sri Kempa Raj.